



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/721,009	11/24/2003	Mahesh Rajagopalan	03-1014	5652				
25537 VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909	7590 01/08/2009		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>ADDY, THUAN KNOWLIN</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER	ADDY, THUAN KNOWLIN		
EXAMINER								
ADDY, THUAN KNOWLIN								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>2614</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2614		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
2614								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>NOTIFICATION DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>01/08/2009</td><td>ELECTRONIC</td></tr></table>	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/08/2009	ELECTRONIC	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
01/08/2009	ELECTRONIC							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

Response to Arguments and Amendments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to Applicants' argument that Doganata, nor Musa disclose the limitation "receiving a communication from one of the conference users to record a message for play back to the initiating user," Examiner will not address the argument due to the fact that this limitation was added to independent claims 1, 31, and 61, after the Final Rejection, therefore, requiring further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.
3. In regards to the above limitation, Applicants state that these recitations were incorporated into independent claim 1 from dependent claim 12 and that in rejecting claim 12, the Final Office Action does not address this recitation of claim 12..."
Examiner, however, would like to bring to Applicants' attention that claim 12 previously recited "processing a conference user declining the computer-enhanced conference call request by **at least one of**: receiving a communication from a conference user to record a message for subsequent play back to the initiating user; receiving a communication declining the request without any further processing by a conference user; receiving a communication from a conference user to set an alternate contact telephone number; and receiving a communication from a conference user to set a period of time in which the conference user is to be contacted again. Therefore, as previously and currently written, all four limitations of claim 12 did (do) not need to be met, just **one of** the four. However, currently amended claim 1 now specifically recites and requires the limitation

"receiving a communication from one of the conference users to record a message for play back to the initiating user." Therefore, requiring further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.

4. In response to Applicants' argument that Doganata, nor Musa disclose the limitation "receiving at least one response from the conference users, the at least one response including an alternate contact telephone number," Examiner will not address the argument due to the fact that this limitation was added to independent claims 17, 47, 62, and 64-67, after the Final Rejection, therefore, requiring further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.

5. In regards to the above limitation, Applicants state that these recitations were incorporated into independent claim 17 from dependent claim 26 and that in rejecting claim 26, the Final Office Action does not address this recitation of claim 26..." Examiner, however, would like to bring to Applicants' attention that claim 26 previously recited "processing a conference user declining the computer-enhanced conference call request by **at least one of**: receiving a communication from a conference user to record a message for subsequent play back to the initiating user; receiving a communication declining the request without any further processing by a conference user; receiving a communication from a conference user to set an alternate contact telephone number; and receiving a communication from a conference user to set a period of time in which the conference user is to be contacted again. Therefore, as previously and currently written, all four limitations of claim 26 did (do) not need to be met, just **one of** the four. However, currently amended claim 17 now specifically recites and requires the limitation

Art Unit: 2614

"receiving at least one response from the conference users, the at least one response including an alternate contact telephone number." Therefore, requiring further consideration and/or search by the Examiner.

/Thjuan K. Addy/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614